INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT TITLE: Gibson Environmental (Bakersfield) Soil Pile Removal		**CALSTARS CODING**: 24315 100204-50 72
PROJECT LOCATION: 2401 Gibson Street	**CITY**: Bakersfield	**COUNTY**: Kern
PROJECT SPONSOR: Gibson Environmental (Bakersfield) PRP Group	**CONTACT**: Dave Roberson de maximis, inc. 2203 Timberloch, Suite 1213 The Woodlands, TX 77380	**PHONE**: 281-363-8733

APPROVAL ACTION UNDER CONSIDERATION BY DTSC:

☐ Initial Permit Issuance ☐ Permit Renewal ☐ Permit Modification ☐ Closure Plan
☐ Removal Action Workplan ☐ Remedial Action Plan ☒ Interim Removal ☐ Regulations
☐ Other (specify):

STATUTORY AUTHORITY:

☐ California H&SC, Chap. 6.5 ☒ California H&SC, Chap. 6.8 ☐ Other (specify):

DTSC PROGRAM/ ADDRESS: Standardized Permitting and Corrective Action Branch 8800 Cal Center Drive, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95826-3200	**CONTACT**: Paul Ruffin	**PHONE**: (916) 255-6677

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project consists of removing approximately 77,400 cubic yards of soil that contains lead at California regulated levels (currently situated in three above-ground piles), approximately 1,600 cubic yards of soil in two additional unregulated piles as well as concrete (at and above the ground surface) and subsurface piping, by loading them into trucks at the Gibson Environmental (Bakersfield) site, a former hazardous waste disposal site ("the Site") and shipping them to an approved off-Site disposal facility.

1. Site Description

The Site is located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the County's master plan and is zoned industrial. See Attachment B, Figure 1. The Site is located near vacant lots and light to medium industrial and commercial activities. Those activities include a concrete mix operation, a restaurant, several oil production wells, a used oil field equipment storage yard, a gasoline station, and an equipment rental facility; all are located within ¼-mile of the Site. The main streets surrounding the Site are Rosedale Highway to the north, Gibson Street to the east, Burr Street to the south, and Case Street to the west.

From 1987 to 1995, the Site was permitted by DTSC as a hazardous waste disposal site operated by Gibson Environmental Inc. (Gibson) that accepted both liquids and soils for disposal. The Site was abandoned by its operator in 1999, after which DTSC issued Imminent and/or Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order, Docket No. I&SE 99/00-002 (the "Order") to a number of identified potentially responsible parties ("PRPs"). Several of those PRPs and others ("the PRP Group") have been implementing the Order since that time.

The Site is currently abandoned and relatively flat except for the presence of five aboveground soil stockpiles on the southern portion of the Site. See Attachment B, Figure 2. Survey results indicate that three of these piles, the North, East and West piles, contain a total of approximately 77,400 cubic yards of soil characterized as non-RCRA California hazardous waste. The two additional piles, the South Pile and the "Oversize" Pile, do not qualify as hazardous waste under state or federal law. There is a concrete pad in the center of the soil pile area. The rest of the southern portion of the Site is unpaved. Two oil pump jacks are present in the southern portion of the

Site among the soil piles. The oil pump jacks are associated with former oil production activities that occurred at the Site before the Site was permitted by DTSC in 1987. The oil pump jacks are owned by a former oil operator at the Site and will not be removed as part of this project. The northern part of the Site formerly contained a tank farm. The tanks, liquids, and sludge were removed in 2000 and 2001. Currently, no tanks used for Gibson operations remain on the property, but sections of the containment walls and concrete platforms associated with the tank farm remain. The northern portion of the Site is paved with concrete, and subsurface piping associated with the former tank farm remains in place. Access to the Site is restricted, as the Site perimeter is fenced and locked.

This project consists of the removal of the five aboveground soil piles, the concrete structures in the northern portion of the Site, and all subsurface piping associated with the former tank farm, steel reinforcement bars, and other materials within the concrete in the former tank farm. All work at the Site will be conducted and overseen by a licensed contractor selected by the PRP Group. The project will also involve construction of a temporary gravel access road to the Site on property located south of the Site at 4750 Burr Street.

2. Soil Pile Removal

The PRP Group's consultant, IT Corporation, analyzed the aboveground soil piles for waste characterization purposes and determined that lead (Pb) concentrations exceed non-RCRA California hazardous waste thresholds in the West, East, and North piles (approximately 77,400 cubic yards). The South Pile and the Oversize Pile consist of approximately 1,600 cubic yards of soil and do not contain concentrations of chemicals exceeding federal or state standards for hazardous waste.

The PRP Group's contractor will remove the West, East and North piles, containing approximately 77,400 cubic yards, using conventional earthmoving equipment for disposal as non-RCRA California hazardous waste. The South Pile and Oversize Pile, a total of approximately 1,600 cubic yards, are not characterized as hazardous waste under either California or federal standards, and will be removed and disposed of as non-hazardous (Class II) waste. While the contract for loading, transportation and disposal has not been finalized, it is anticipated that the West, East and North piles will be transported to Waste Management/Kettleman Hills. The South and Oversize Piles will be transported to Waste Management/McKittrick. The handling, loading, transportation and disposal of all five soil piles will be pursuant to a DTSC-approved Interim Removal Measures Work Plan. All site work will be conducted in accordance with industry standards; local, state and federal environmental regulations; and the Order. It is anticipated that hours of operation will be approximately 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., 5 days per week, and that approximately 90 trucks can be loaded and transported for disposal each work day. Based on these estimates, it is anticipated that the soil pile removal will be accomplished in approximately 60 working days. A total of approximately 5,100 truck loads will be required to remove the soil piles from the Site. Of that total, it is anticipated that 149 truck loads will be transported to McKittrick.

Soil pile removal activities will include mobilization of equipment, establishing on-site operations, and shaping the soil piles to ensure safe and efficient loading. A truck-loading and decontamination station will be constructed, and erosion control measures will be implemented. A temporary, off-site access road will be constructed on the property to the south to allow access to the Site from Burr Street. On-site equipment is expected to include weight scales to insure proper loading of trucks, rubber-tired front-end loaders, a water truck, and either a bulldozer or tracked excavator as appropriate to the operations. Soil pile removal activities will be conducted with measures to control air emissions as described in Environmental Impact Analysis, Section 3. Air Quality.

3. Removal of Concrete Structures and Subsurface Piping

The concrete pads, platforms, containment walls, sumps, and piping located in the former tank farm area will be demolished and removed for disposal or recycling. These activities will also include loading, transportation, demolition, and disposal or recycling of demolition waste/debris.

Demolition activities will include the removal of all concrete and associated improvements in the former tank farm area, which includes sumps, drains, platforms, containment walls, subsurface piping, exposed pipe, steel reinforcement bars, and other features of the concrete pads.

Demolition of the concrete will be conducted with measures to control air emissions as described in Environmental Impact Analysis, Section 3. Air Quality. Concrete debris, steel reinforcement bars, subsurface piping, and other demolition wastes/debris will be separated, segregated, and stockpiled. Demolition stockpiles will be characterized and off-hauled to an appropriate disposal or recycling facility based on the results of the post-demolition characterization. To the extent materials are recyclable, it is anticipated they would be

transported to the Golden State Metals recycling facility located at 2000 E. Brundage Lane in Bakersfield. It is estimated that approximately 111 truckloads will be transported to Golden States Metals.

Following completion of demolition activities, the areas where sumps were removed will be backfilled to grade using clean fill.

4. Transport of Materials for Disposal

To reach Kettleman City, trucks will leave the Site via Commercial Street, turn left on Gibson Street, turn right on Rosedale Highway, and turn left on Buck Owens Boulevard to State Highway 99 northbound. From Highway 99, trucks will take Highway 46 (eastbound) to Interstate 5 (northbound) to the Waste Management Kettleman Hills facility.

Returning, trucks will take Interstate 5 (southbound) and exit on Rosedale Highway, then proceed on Rosedale to Gibson, turn right (southbound) on Gibson, right (westbound) on Burr Street, and right (northbound) on the temporary access road into the site. The transportation route to Kettleman Hills is shown in Attachment B, Figure 3.

A lease is presently in place for access to the Site from Burr Street. Trucks will enter the Site across the property located directly adjacent to the Site to the South, which is owned by the Burk Family Trust ("Burk Property"). See Attachment B, Figure 4. This route of access will require construction of a temporary composite access road. The road will be removed immediately following completion of the project and the Burk property will be restored to its original condition.

In addition to the trucks transporting soil to Kettleman Hills, a small number of trucks will also transport Class II soil to McKittrick (approximately 149 truckloads) and recyclable material to Golden State Metals (approximately 111 truckloads.)

5. Removal of Unanticipated Waste and Soil

Additional issues may arise after the project commences, including the discovery of unexpected debris, or components in the soil piles. If unexpected waste is encountered, it will be characterized and disposed of at an appropriate waste disposal facility.

To the extent that unanticipated materials exceed the parameters of the current Interim Removal Measures Work Plan, such materials will be left on Site. Final action for any materials left on this Site will be determined after completion of a Feasibility Study on the Site as part of a Final Remedial Action Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS:

1. Aesthetics

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- Temporary presence of trucks and earth-moving equipment on-site during soil removal activities.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The Site is an abandoned hazardous waste facility located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the County's master plan and is zoned industrial. The Site is located near vacant lots and light to medium industrial and commercial activities. Those activities include a concrete mix operation, a restaurant, several oil production wells, a used oil field equipment storage yard, a gasoline station, and an equipment rental facility; all are located within ¼-mile of the Site. The main streets surrounding the Site are Rosedale Highway to the north, Gibson Street to the east, Burr Street to the south, and Case Street to the west.

The Site is currently abandoned and relatively flat except for the presence of five aboveground soil stockpiles on the southern portion of the Site. There is a concrete pad in the center of the soil pile area. The rest of the southern portion of the Site is unpaved. The northern portion of the Site is paved with concrete; subsurface piping associated with the former tank farm remains in place. Access to the Site is restricted, as the Site perimeter is fenced and locked.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Impact Analysis:

There are no scenic vistas or visual resources at the site. By removing large soil piles and conducting DTSC-approved removal measures, the proposed project will substantially enhance the visual quality and character of the site and surrounding properties.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

Impact Analysis:

Presently, there are no such resources at or near the site. The site is not located within a designated scenic highway.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

d. Create a new source of substantial light of glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Impact Analysis:

Work activities will take place during daylight hours only, so no new source of substantial light or glare will result. No artificial lighting will be necessary to carry out the project.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

- October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.
- http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm

2. Agricultural Resources

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- None. There are no agricultural resources or operations at or near the Site.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The project site is located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the City's master plan and is zoned industrial. There are no agricultural resources or operations at or near the Site. The proposed project would not convert farmland to nonagricultural use or conflict with zoning for agricultural uses. As such, no further analysis of Agricultural Resources is deemed necessary.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

Impact Analysis:

No impact. The project site is located in an "Urban and Built-Up Land" area, i.e., a non-farmland area, on the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program map.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

b. Conflict with existing zoning or agriculture use, or Williamson Act contract.

Impact Analysis:

No impact. The project site is located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the City's master plan and is zoned industrial.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural uses.

Impact Analysis:

No impact; see above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

- October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.
- Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program map, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/images/fmmp2002_300.pdf

3. Air Quality

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- Dust characterized as non-RCRA California hazardous waste may drift off-site during excavation and loading activities;
- Dust characterized as non-RCRA California hazardous waste may drift from the trucks in transit;
- Exhaust will be generated from trucks and loaders used for the project; and
- Dust will be generated by demolition of concrete structures.

The project is expected to take approximately 60 working days, so any air-quality impacts will be temporary and short-lived.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The Site is located within the jurisdiction of the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD). The SJVUAPCD is responsible for enforcing air quality standards within its jurisdiction established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the federal Environmental Protection Agency. These air quality standards contain averaging times and threshold concentration levels for certain criteria pollutants that cannot be exceeded by proposed projects. Kern County has been designated by CARB as a non-attainment area for Ozone and PM-10. The EPA has designated the area as being in non-attainment with Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone, PM-10 and PM-2.5.

The Site is located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the County's master plan and is zoned industrial. The Site is located near vacant lots and light to medium industrial and commercial activities. The proposed project involves removal and disposal of approximately 77,400 cubic yards of soil categorized as non-RCRA California hazardous waste, currently contained in large soil piles at the site, as well as 1,600 cubic yards of soil not categorized as hazardous waste and concrete pads and piping.

Because the project is a construction project, analysis of the project's air quality impacts is governed by Section 4.3.1 of the SJVUAPCD's Guidelines For Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (2002) ["Guidelines"], which provides, in relevant part:

4.3.1 Threshold of Significance for Project Construction Impacts

Pollutants of Concern. A project's construction phase produces many types of emissions, but PM-10 is the pollutant of greatest concern. PM-10 emissions can result from a variety of construction activities, including excavation, grading, demolition, vehicle travel on paved and unpaved surfaces, and vehicle exhaust. Construction-related emissions can cause substantial increases in localized concentrations of PM-10, as well as affecting PM-10 compliance with ambient air quality standards on a regional basis. Particulate emissions from construction activities can lead to adverse health effects as well as nuisance concerns such as reduced visibility and soiling of exposed surfaces. The use of diesel powered construction equipment produces ozone precursor emissions and combustion related particulate emissions.

The SJVUAPCD's general approach to CEQA analyses of construction PM-10 impacts is to require implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures. PM-10 emitted during construction can vary greatly depending on the level of activity, the specific operations taking place, the equipment being operated, local soils, weather conditions,

and other factors, making quantification difficult. Despite this variability in emissions, experience has shown that there are a number of feasible control measures that can be reasonably implemented to significantly reduce PM-10 emissions from construction.

The SJVUAPCD recognizes that construction equipment can also emit carbon monoxide and ozone precursor emissions. The SJVUAPCD has determined that these emissions may cause a significant air quality impact and has requested a more detailed analysis.

A quantitative analysis of NOx, PM10, and reactive organic gases (ROG) was conducted using a model provided by the SJVUAPCD. This analysis considered the emissions that would be produced during on-site activities and transportation of soil and demolition wastes/debris to the disposal and recycling facilities. Project specific information regarding the proposed equipment and the duration of operations were used as inputs into the model. The contractor selected for the project will be using aqueous diesel fuel; therefore, an emission reduction factor was incorporated in the analysis. Total project NOx emissions were estimated to be approximately 9.86 tons, PM10 emissions were estimated to be approximately 0.12 tons, and ROG emissions were estimated to be approximately 0.22 tons. Based on these calculations, the estimated emissions are below the District's thresholds of significance. SJVUAPCD does not consider the project to have a significant impact on air quality and no additional mitigation measures beyond best management practices (BMPs) for construction sites are required as stated in their October 5, 2006 letter.

A quantitative analysis of the potential health risk to nearby off-site receptors from diesel particulate emissions and chemicals adhered to soil particulates during on-site activities was also conducted. The analysis assessed the potential health risk to commercial and residential receptors located approximately 200 and 300 meters from the site, respectively. Project specific information regarding the proposed equipment, the duration of operations, and chemicals concentrations in the soil stockpiles were used as inputs into the risk assessment models. SJVUAPCD defines the significance levels of toxic impacts as a cancer risk greater than 10 in a million and/or a hazard index (HI) of 1.0 or greater for chronic noncarcinogenic or acute health effects. The estimated excess lifetime cancer risks from diesel particulate emissions and chemicals adhered to particulates are below 10 in a million, respectively. The estimated noncancer HIs are below the threshold of 1.0. Based on these results, potential impacts from diesel emission particulates and chemicals in stockpile soil are not considered significant by the SJVUAPCD as stated in their October 5, 2006 letter.

The project will be implemented in compliance with Regulation VIII, Rules 4101 and 4102, and with Guidelines Tables 6-2 and 6-3, as appropriate and more specifically described below. Therefore, under Guidelines Section 4.3.1 (quoted above), the project's air quality impacts will be less than significant.

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Impact Analysis:

The proposed project will be implemented in compliance with SJVUAPCD Regulation VIII (specifically, Rule 8021) and with Guidelines Tables 6-2 and 6-3, including, specifically:

- Areas not being actively utilized for construction purposes will be effectively stabilized from dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer or other suitable cover or vegetation, as required;
- Unpaved roads will be effectively stabilized from dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant, as required;
- Excavation, grading and concrete demolition will be effectively controlled from fugitive dust emissions utilizing water, as required;
- All trucks will be covered and at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container will be maintained;
- Equipment decontamination procedures will be implemented for equipment leaving the Site;
- Traffic speeds will be limited on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph);
- Erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to adjacent roads or properties will be implemented;
- An air monitoring plan will be implemented on Site to assure compliance with SJVUAPCD Regulation VIII. Based on that monitoring, excavation and grading activity may be suspended when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
- Table 8021-1 Control Measures for Construction, Excavation, Extraction, and Other Earthmoving Activities:
  - Pre-Activity:
    - A1 Pre-water site sufficient to limit Visible Dust Emissions (VDE) to 20% opacity and
    - A2 Phase work to reduce the amount of disturbed surface area at any one time.
  - During Active Operations:

- B1 Apply water or chemical/organic stabilizers/suppressants sufficient to limit VDE to 20% opacity; or
- B2 Construct and maintain wind barriers sufficient to limit VDE to 20 % opacity. If utilizing wind barriers, control measure B1 shall also be implemented.
- B3 Apply water or chemical/organic stabilizers/suppressants to unpaved haul/access roads and unpaved vehicle/equipment traffic areas sufficient to limit VDE to 20% opacity and meet the conditions of a stabilized unpaved road surface.

- Temporary Stabilization During Periods of Inactivity:
  - C1 Restrict vehicular access to the area; and
  - C2 Apply water or chemical or organic stabilizers/suppressants, sufficient to comply with the conditions of a stabilized surface. If an area having 0.5 acres or more of disturbed surface area remains unused for seven or more days, the area must comply with the conditions for a stabilized surface area as defined in section 3.58 of Rule 8011.

The above measures will be incorporated into a Dust Control Plan and an Air Monitoring Plan to be submitted to the SJVUAPCD.

A quantitative analysis of NOx, PM10, and reactive organic gases (ROG) was conducted using a model provided by the SJVUAPCD. This analysis considered the emissions that would be produced during on-site activities and transportation of soil and demolition wastes/debris to the disposal and recycling facilities. Total project NOx emissions were estimated to be approximately 9.86 tons, PM10 emissions were estimated to be approximately 0.12 tons, and ROG emissions were estimated to be approximately 0.22 tons. Based on these calculations, the estimated emissions are below the District's thresholds of significance.

A quantitative analysis of the potential health risk to nearby off-site receptors from diesel particulate emissions and chemicals adhered to soil particulates during on-site activities was also conducted. The analysis assessed the potential health risk to commercial and residential receptors located approximately 200 and 300 meters from the site, respectively. SJVUAPCD defines the significance levels of toxic impacts as a cancer risk greater than 10 in a million and/or a hazard index (HI) of 1.0 or greater for chronic noncarcinogenic or acute health effects. The estimated excess lifetime cancer risks from diesel particulate emissions and chemicals adhered to particulates are below 10 in a million, respectively. The estimated noncancer HIs are below the threshold of 1.0.

The SJVUAPCD reviewed all of the above submissions and issued a letter dated October 5, 2006 indicating that no additional mitigation factors are required.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

c. Result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above. The proposed project has the potential to create two types of air emission impacts: (1) vehicle exhaust; and (2) emissions of dust from the site and/or trucks during transport. Modeling and risk assessment presented to the SJVUAPCD indicate that the mitigation measures set forth in item a. above will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above. Risk analysis submitted to the SJVUAPCD does not indicate unacceptable exposure to sensitive receptors.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

f. Result in human exposure to Naturally Occurring Asbestos (see also Geology and Soils, f.).

Impact Analysis:

The soil piles are free-standing and do not contain asbestos, and there is no known naturally occurring asbestos in the area from which the concrete pads and piping will be excavated.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

- October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.
- http://valleyair.org/aqinfo/attainment.htm
- http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/CEQA%20Rules/GAMAQI%20Jan%202002%20Rev.pdf
- Diesel Emission Risk Calculations, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc., submitted to SJVUAPCD via e-mail on September 15, 2006
- Chemical-specific Emission Risk Calculations, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc., submitted to SJVUAPCD via e-mail on September 20, 2006

- ❖ Emission Calculations (NOx, PM10, ROG), prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc., submitted to SJVUAPCD via e-mail on September 26, 2006
- ❖ October 5, 2006, Ms. Georgia A Stewart, SJVUAPCD, to Mr. Mohinder S. Sandhu, DTSC, Subject: Initial Study/Draft Negative Declaration, Gibson Environmental (Bakersfield) Site Soil Pile Removal

4. Biological Resources

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- ❖ Trucks and earth-moving equipment moving, loading, and hauling contaminated soils; and,
- ❖ Fugitive dust generated during earth-moving activities.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The Site is an abandoned hazardous waste facility located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the County's master plan and is zoned industrial. The Site is located near vacant lots and light to medium industrial and commercial activities. Those activities include a concrete mix operation, a restaurant, several oil production wells, a used oil field equipment storage yard, a gasoline station, and an equipment rental facility; all are located within ¼-mile of the Site. The Site is relatively flat except for the presence of aboveground soil stockpiles (North, South, East, West, and Oversize) on the southern portion of the Site.

A biological survey was completed August 4, 2006. This survey included the portion of the adjacent Burk Property upon which a temporary access road will be constructed. The survey indicated no substantial adverse affect on any sensitive species or its habitat. A copy of the biological survey is attached to this Initial Study as Attachment C. The biological survey concludes that no endangered, threatened or sensitive species or habitats for those species are present at the Site, and hence the project will have no biological impact.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Impact Analysis:

Based upon the above, the proposed project will have no adverse affect on any such species.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Impact Analysis:

The proposed project is not located in a riparian setting.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Impact Analysis:

There are no federally protected wetlands on the site, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Impact Analysis:

There are no migratory fish or native wildlife species at the site.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

e. Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Impact Analysis:

There are no trees on the site, and it is not part of any Habitat Conservation Plan, Community Conservation Plan, or other habitat conservation plan.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Impact Analysis:

See above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

❖ October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.

5. Cultural Resources

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

❖ None. No cultural, archaeological, or paleontological resources are known to exist at the Site.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The Site is an abandoned hazardous waste facility located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the County's master plan and is zoned industrial. The Site is located near vacant lots and light to medium industrial and commercial activities. Those activities include a concrete mix operation, a restaurant, several oil production wells, a used oil field equipment storage yard, a gasoline station, and an equipment rental facility; all are located within ¼-mile of the Site. The main streets surrounding the Site are Rosedale Highway to the north, Gibson Street to the east, Burr Street to the south, and Case Street to the west.

From 1987 to 1995, the Site was permitted as a hazardous waste disposal site that accepted both liquids and soils for disposal. The Site was abandoned by its operator in 1999, after which the Department of Toxic Substances Control ("DTSC") issued Imminent and/or Substantial Endangerment Determination and Order and Remedial Action Order, Docket No. I&SE 99/00-002 (the "Order") to a number of identified potentially responsible parties ("PRPs"). Several of those PRPs and others ("the PRP Group") have been implementing the Order since that time.

The Site is relatively flat except for the presence of aboveground soil stockpiles on the southern portion of the Site. The project site is not adjacent to areas known to contain prehistoric cultural/paleontological sites. Consequently, it is unlikely that prehistoric resources would be encountered during the project work.

Potential impacts to archaeological and historical resources were evaluated in reports compiled through the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and the database maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Those reports indicate no significant impacts to archaeological or historic resources.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5.

Impact Analysis:

Due to the lack of historical resources in the area, no impact is anticipated.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to 15064.5.

Impact Analysis:

Due to the lack of archaeological resources in the area, no impact is anticipated.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Impact Analysis:

Due to the lack of paleontological resources in the area, no impact is anticipated.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Impact Analysis:

Because there are no known human remains in the area, no such disturbance is anticipated.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

- October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.
- http://www.sacredsites.com/americas/united_states/united_states.html

6. Geology and Soils

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- Removal of soil piles from the Site;
- Excavation and removal of concrete pads and piping; and,
- Transport to and disposal of soil, concrete, and piping at appropriate disposal facilities.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The Site is underlain by sand units ranging up to 25 feet thick; separated by units of slightly coarser-grained and slightly finer-grained soils. Groundwater was first encountered at depths generally ranging between approximately 52 and 57 feet. Depth to groundwater in on-site monitoring wells ranges from 42.6 to 63.5 feet below the top of the well casings.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

■ Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42).

Because the project consists solely of the removal of aboveground soil piles, concrete and piping, no structures will be built that might be exposed (or might expose people using them) to adverse effects. Also, the closest known fault (part of the White Wolf Fault system) is over six miles away from the Site. Therefore, no earthquake-related impact is anticipated.

■ Strong seismic ground shaking.

See above.

- Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

  See above.

- Landslides.

  See above. Also, the Site is flat, and is not located in any of the landslide areas mapped in the Safety Element of the Kern County General Plan. Therefore, landslides are not anticipated.

  Impact Analysis:

  See above.

  Conclusion:
  ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
  ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact
  ☐ No Impact

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

  Impact Analysis:

  The proposed project will entail the removal of soil piles and concrete pads and piping and backfilling (with clean fill) as needed to return the areas of concrete and piping removal to natural grade. Therefore, no substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil is anticipated.

  Conclusion:
  ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
  ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact
  ☐ No Impact

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

  Impact Analysis:

  See above. Because the project does not entail building anything on Site, it will not add any load to the Site and, therefore, will not potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

  Conclusion:

  ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
  ☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact
  ☐ No Impact

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.

  Impact Analysis:

  See response to item c. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of water.

Impact Analysis:

The proposed project does not entail construction of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

f. Be located in an area containing naturally occurring asbestos (see also Air Quality, f.).

Impact Analysis:

There is no known naturally occurring asbestos at the site.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

- October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.
- http://www.co.kern.ca.us/planning/pdfs/kcgp/KCGPChp4Safety.pdf (see figures 12 and 13)

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- Removal of soil piles characterized as non-RCRA California hazardous waste from the Site;
- Excavation and removal of concrete pads and piping; and,
- Transport to and disposal of soil and piping/debris at appropriate disposal facilities.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The PRP Group's consultant, IT Corporation, analyzed the aboveground soil piles for waste characterization purposes and determined that lead (Pb) concentrations exceed non-RCRA California hazardous waste thresholds in the West, East, and North piles, consisting of approximately 77,400 cubic yards of soil. The South Pile and Oversize Pile, consisting of approximately 1,600 cubic yards of soil, do not contain concentrations of chemicals exceeding federal or state standards for hazardous waste.

The West, East and North piles will be removed using conventional earthmoving equipment and trucked to an authorized hazardous waste (Class 1) disposal facility. The South Pile and Oversize Piles are characterized as not containing hazardous waste under either California or federal standards. These piles, consisting of approximately 1,600 cubic yards will be removed, but disposed of according to their non-hazardous waste characteristics. Soil from the West, East and North piles will be loaded into dump trucks and transported to a licensed disposal facility. The West, East and North piles will be transported to Waste Management/Kettleman Hills. The South and Oversize piles

will be transported to Waste Management/McKittrick. A total of approximately 5,100 truck loads will be required to remove the soil piles from the Site. Of that total, it is anticipated that approximately 149 truck loads would go to McKittrick.

Soil pile removal activities will begin with the contractor mobilizing equipment, establishing on-site operations, and shaping the existing soil piles to ensure safe and efficient loading. A truck-loading and decontamination station will be constructed, and erosion control measures will be implemented. On-site equipment is expected to include weight scales to insure proper loading of trucks, rubber-tired front-end loaders, a water truck, and either a bulldozer or tracked excavator as appropriate to the operations.

The concrete pads, platforms, containment walls, sumps, and piping located in the former tank farm will be demolished and removed for disposal. These activities will also include loading, transportation, demolition, and disposal of demolition waste/debris. Demolition activities will include the removal of all concrete and associated improvements, which includes sumps, drains, platforms, containment walls, subsurface piping, exposed pipe, steel reinforcement bars, and other features of the concrete pads.

Demolition of the concrete pad will be conducted in accordance with the air mitigation measures described in Section 3 above. Concrete debris, steel reinforcement bars, subsurface piping, and other demolition wastes/debris will be separated, segregated, and stockpiled. Demolition stockpiles will be characterized and off-hauled to an appropriate disposal or concrete recycling facility based on the results of the post-demolition characterization. If the material is recyclable, it will be transported to the Golden State Metals recycling facility at 2000 E. Brundage Lane in Bakersfield. It is anticipated that no more than 111 truckloads of material would be transported to Golden State.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment throughout the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.

Impact Analysis:

The proposed project is a removal action that will involve the loading, transport and disposal of above ground soil piles that have been characterized as non-RCRA California hazardous waste because of their lead content. However, implementation of mitigation measures will reduce the project's potential risk to the public to less than significant. The project is temporary, with an expected duration of 60 working days, with 7 to 9 trucks per hour leaving the Site for the disposal facility. Therefore, any risk to the public will be brief in duration. The lead-containing soil will be removed, handled, and transported by licensed hazardous waste handlers, and will be disposed of at a licensed hazardous waste facility. A truck-loading and decontamination station will be constructed, and erosion control measures will be implemented. On-site equipment is expected to include weight scales to insure proper loading of trucks, rubber-tired front-end loaders, a water truck, and either a bulldozer or tracked excavator as appropriate to the operations. Public access to the Site during IRM activities will be restricted by maintaining the existing chain-link fence around the Site in all areas not required for truck access. Locked gates will control truck access routes onto the Site when removal activity is not occurring. Air quality impacts from the hazardous materials will be reduced to less than significant via the implementation of the measures (including covered trucks, equipment decontamination and dust suppression) discussed in the Air Quality impacts section above, in accordance with the requirements of the SJVUAPCD. A project manager will be present on the Site during all IRM activities.

This interim removal measure will remove remnants of the former Gibson operating facility, and all soil piles including hazardous waste will be removed from the Site. Following completion of the interim removal measures described in the Work Plan, a Feasibility Study will be completed, and the Site will be evaluated for final remedial action suitable for industrial use. It is anticipated that a deed restriction will be imposed on the Site.

Prior to commencing work at the Site, the contractor will be required to prepare a Health and Safety Plan in accordance with applicable laws to ensure the safety of the contractor and any subcontractors on-site during the duration of the project, and to protect the health and safety of the public. The Health and Safety Plan will address all of the following issues:

- Potential chemical and physical hazards at the Site;
- Personal protective equipment for contractor and employees;
- Site controls, such as site security and sanitation;
- Decontamination procedures;
- Safety practices and operating procedures;
- Emergency response procedures; and

- Training, medical surveillance, and recordkeeping.

A quantitative analysis of the potential health risk to nearby off-site receptors from diesel particulate emissions and chemicals adhered to soil particulates during on-site activities was also conducted. The analysis assessed the potential health risk to commercial and residential receptors located approximately 200 and 300 meters from the site, respectively. SJVUAPCD defines the significance levels of toxic impacts as a cancer risk greater than 10 in a million and/or a hazard index (HI) of 1.0 or greater for chronic noncarcinogenic or acute health effects. The estimated excess lifetime cancer risks from diesel particulate emissions and chemicals adhered to particulates are below 10 in a million, respectively. The estimated noncancer HIs are below the threshold of 1.0.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above. Also, there are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the Site.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to public or the environment.

Impact Analysis:

The site is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

e. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Impact Analysis:

Project activities will not interfere with emergency personnel access to the Site or to neighboring properties. Therefore, no impairment or physical interference with emergency plans is anticipated.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

References Used:

- October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.
- http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- Removal of lead-containing soil piles from the Site;
- Excavation and removal of concrete pads and piping; and,
- Transport to and disposal of removed materials at appropriate facilities.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The Site is located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the County's master plan and is zoned industrial. The Kern River is located approximately ½ mile from the Site. There are no other surface water bodies located within one mile of the Site. The Site is underlain by sand units ranging up to 25 feet thick; separated by units of slightly coarser-grained and slightly finer-grained soils. Groundwater was first encountered at depths generally ranging between approximately 52 and 57 feet. Depth to groundwater in on-site monitoring wells ranges from 42.6 to 63.5 feet below the top of the well casings.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Impact Analysis:

The proposed project could create a temporary impact on the amount the storm water runoff from the Site, which could potentially contain traces of lead containing soil at the site characterized as non-RCRA California hazardous waste. However, implementation of project controls will reduce potential impact to less than significant. Storm water impact controls will include submittal of a Notice of Intent to Comply With the Storm Water General Permit (General Permit) to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to describe Best Management Practices to prevent impairment of receiving waters by storm water containing sediment silt or other pollutants. Berms currently surrounding the soil piles will prevent any storm water that comes in contact with the soil piles from leaving the area. The remaining areas of the site do not contain significant levels of contaminants that could potentially pollute storm water runoff.

Conclusion:

☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficient in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).

Impact Analysis:

The proposed project will not deplete or affect groundwater supplies or recharge. The proposed project does not involve the use of any groundwater, nor any filling, grading, or building activities that would affect groundwater recharge. The PRP Group conducted groundwater monitoring between 1999 and 2004. Based upon the results of that monitoring, the DTSC concluded that groundwater was not affected by operations at the Site and monitoring activities were discontinued.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site.

Impact Analysis:

The project will not alter the natural drainage pattern of the Site or area. See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item c. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

g. Place within a 100-flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

Impact Analysis:

The project does not involve the placement of any structures anywhere.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item g. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

i. Inundation by sieche, tsunami or mudflow.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item g. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

❖ October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.

9. Land Use and Planning

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

❖ None. The proposed project is consistent with all existing land use and planning documents for the Site and surrounding area.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The Site is located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the County's master plan and is zoned industrial. The Site is located near vacant lots and light to medium industrial and commercial activities. Those activities include a concrete mix operation, a restaurant, several oil production wells, a used oil field equipment storage yard, a gasoline station, and an equipment rental facility; all are located within ¼-mile of the Site. This project is consistent with all existing land use and planning documents for the site and surrounding area.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Impact Analysis:

This project is consistent with all existing land use and planning documents for the site and surrounding area.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

b. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Impact Analysis:

There is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan applicable to the site.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

❖ October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.

10. Mineral Resources

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

❖ None. The proposed project will not interfere with the potential use of any mineral resource. Therefore, no analysis is deemed necessary.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

Prior to being used as a hazardous waste handling facility, the site was used for crude oil production, perhaps as early as the 1940s. Gibson Oil purchased the property in 1979, and thereafter used it for oil refining and recycling.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

Impact Analysis:

The proposed project will not interfere with the potential use of any mineral resource.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

❖ October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.

11. Noise

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

❖ Trucks and earth-moving equipment present on-site during loading and removal of soil piles, concrete pads and piping; and,

❖ Transport to and disposal of materials at appropriate facilities.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The Site is located in an unincorporated area of Kern County designated for industrial use in the County's master plan and is zoned industrial. The Site is located near vacant lots and light to medium industrial and commercial activities. Those activities include a concrete mix operation, a restaurant, several oil production wells, a used oil field equipment storage yard, a gasoline station, and an equipment rental facility; all are located within ¼-mile of the Site. The main streets surrounding the Site are Rosedale Highway to the north, Gibson Street to the east, Burr Street to the south, and Case Street to the west.

It is anticipated that hours of operation will be from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., 5 days per week, that approximately 90 trucks can be loaded and transported for disposal each work day and that the soil pile removal can be accomplished in approximately 60 working days. A total of approximately 5,100 truck loads will be required to remove the soil piles from the Site. The concrete pads, platforms, containment walls, sumps, and piping located in the former tank farm area will be demolished and removed for disposal. Demolition activities will include the removal of all concrete and associated improvements in the tank farm area, which includes sumps, drains, platforms, containment walls, subsurface piping, exposed pipe, steel reinforcement bars, and other features of the concrete pads. Following completion of demolition activities, the areas where sumps were removed will be backfilled to grade using clean fill.

It is anticipated that 77,400 cubic yards of soil from the Site will be disposed at Kettleman Hills. To reach Kettleman Hills, trucks will leave the Site via Commercial Street, turn left on Gibson Street, turn right on Rosedale Highway, and turn left on Buck Owens Boulevard to State Highway 99 northbound to State Highway 46 west to Interstate 5.

Returning, trucks will exit Interstate 5, go left (eastbound) on Rosedale Highway, right (southbound) on Gibson, right (westbound) on Burr, right (northbound) into the site. A lease is in place for access to the Site via a temporary access road from Burr Street. The transportation route anticipated for Kettleman Hills is shown in Attachment B, Figure 3. Some additional truckloads would carry Class II soil to McKittrick (approximately 149 truckloads) and recyclable materials to Golden State Metals (approximately 111 truckloads).

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

Impact Analysis:

The Bakersfield General Plan Noise Element contemplates limiting permanent additions to noise levels. Because the project is temporary, no permanent additions to noise levels are anticipated. Bakersfield's noise-related standard for construction-related noise is contained in Section 9.22.050 of the Bakersfield Municipal Code, which states that all construction activities shall take place between 6 a.m. and 9 p.m. weekdays. The proposed project hours (7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. weekdays) correlate to a lesser noise impact than contemplated by the Code. Also, the Site is located in an industrial zone. Therefore, noise impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels.

Impact Analysis:

See above. Also, no excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels are anticipated.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Impact Analysis:

The project is temporary in duration and will therefore not permanent increase ambient noise levels.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

References Used:

- October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.
- http://www.ci.bakersfield.ca.us/cityservices/devsrv/pdfs/generalplan.pdf

12. Population and Housing

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- None.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The project entails solely the removal of soil piles, concrete and piping from the Site. The scope of the project does not include the future development of the Site. Therefore, no further analysis is deemed necessary.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Induce substantial population growth in area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

13. Public Services

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- Transport to and disposal of soil, concrete and piping at appropriate disposal facilities.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The Site is located in an unincorporated area of Bakersfield, California. Public services are provided by the City of Bakersfield and the County of Kern. The temporary increase in traffic caused by trucks entering and leaving the Site could potentially impact the condition of area roads, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Kern County Roads Department. The Kern County Roads Department is aware of the proposed project and has approved the proposed routes, provided that the project control measures set forth below are implemented. Caltrans has also been informed of the proposed routes. No public facilities other than roads are impacted by this project.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- Fire protection
- Police protection
- Schools
- Parks
- Other public facilities

Impact Analysis:

Implementation of project control measures will reduce any impacts on area roads to less than significant. Pursuant to an agreement between the PRP Group and the Kern County Roads Department, the following measures will be implemented:

- While the project is under construction, the condition of all County Roads shall be monitored and the roadways shall be kept in a safe operating condition using generally accepted methods of maintenance; and
- At the conclusion of the project, repair of damage to the roadway shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Kern County Roads Department.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

References Used:

14. Recreation

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

❖ None.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The proposed project is located in an industrial setting and is temporary in duration. The proposed project will not affect or otherwise result in an increase in demand for recreational facilities. Therefore, it will not have an effect on recreational facilities, and no further analysis is deemed necessary.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

b. Include recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

15. Transportation and Traffic

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- Removal of lead-containing soil piles from the Site;
- Excavation and removal of concrete pads and piping; and,
- Transport to and disposal of soil, concrete and piping at appropriate facilities.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

Traffic counts for relevant portions of the major roads included in the primary hauling route are as follows:

STREET	TRAFFIC (vehicles/day)
Commercial Street	n/a
Gibson Street	1450
Rosedale Highway/State Highway 58	32,000 – 50,000
Buck Owens Boulevard	23,125
State Highway 99	63,000 – 97,000
State Highway 46	6,700 – 8,300
Interstate 5	32,000 – 38,000
Burr Street	n/a

The project may result in a temporary increase in traffic caused by trucks entering and leaving the Site. However, the traffic impacts are insignificant because the project: (i) is temporary, with an expected duration of approximately 60 working days and (ii) will generate 7 to 9 trips per hour. The anticipated route for transportation in the area of the Site is shown on Attachment B, Figure 4. Due to the duration of the project and the limited number of vehicle trips, no significant increase in traffic load is anticipated. The project will not impact air traffic, road design features, emergency access, parking or any policies or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).

Impact Analysis:

The project is temporary and limited in scope. Therefore, any impact on traffic is anticipated to be less than significant.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the country congestion management agency for designated roads or highway.

Impact Analysis:

See response to item a. above.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

c. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

The project does not involve any change in design features or incompatible use.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

d. Result in inadequate emergency access.

Impact Analysis:

The project does not involve any alteration in or effect on emergency access.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

e. Result in inadequate parking capacity.

Impact Analysis:

The proposed project will have no effect on parking capacity.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

Impact Analysis:

The proposed project will not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

References Used:

- *http://www.co.kern.ca.us/roads/pdf/Traffic_Counts.pdf*
- *http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/saferesr/trafdata/2005all.htm*
- *http://www.bakersfieldcity.us/weblink7/Browse.aspx?startid=342577*

16. Utilities and Service Systems

Project Activities Likely to Create an Impact:

- None.

Description of Baseline Environmental Conditions:

The proposed project involves no construction of facilities that will use public utilities or service systems for any extended period. All utilities required to complete the removal project will be supplied by the contractor hired to conduct the operation. Therefore, no further analysis is deemed required.

In compliance with 8 C.C.R. § 1541, an Underground Service Alert notification will be conducted at least 48 hours prior to commencement of the project.

Analysis as to whether or not project activities would:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

e. Result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments.

Impact Analysis:

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☐ Less Than Significant Impact
☒ No Impact

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs.

Impact Analysis:

Non-hazardous solid waste generated by the project is anticipated to be disposed of at the Waste Management facility at McKittrick, which has sufficient permitted capacity for the project. The project will not create an on-going need for solid waste disposal.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Impact Analysis:

The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Conclusion:
☐ Potentially Significant Impact
☐ Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated
☒ Less Than Significant Impact
☐ No Impact

References Used:

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Based on evidence provided in this Initial Study, DTSC makes the following findings:

a. The project ☐ has ☒does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. See evaluations in Section 4. Biological Resources and Section 5. Cultural Resources.

b. The project ☐ has ☒does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. Based on information from the City of Bakersfield Planning Department there are four projects in the vicinity of the Site which may be underway during the Gibson IRM Work Plan project: 1) 3927 Marriot Drive; 2) 3801 Marriot Drive; 3) 3001 Buck Owens Boulevard; and, 4) Tracts 6003 and 6042, south of Krebs Road and east of Mohawk Street. 3927 Marriot Drive is the location of a proposed 120-room hotel and is approximately 400 feet from the Site. As of August 10, 2006, the project was in "plan check" and the building permit had not been issued. 3801 Marriot Drive is the location of a 119-room hotel under construction and is approximately 500 feet from the Site. 3001 Buck Owens Boulevard is the location of a 92-room hotel under construction and is approximately 1 mile from the Site. Tracts 6003 and 6042 are the location of a large-scale housing development that is in progress and are approximately 1 mile from the Site. As of August 10, 2006, Tract 6003 was about 90% built out and the southern third of Tract 6042 was under construction. To the extent that the projects on Marriot Drive are under construction at the same time as the Gibson IRM Work Plan project, there may be cumulative impacts on air quality and traffic on Gibson Street south of Rosedale Highway. However, the potential impacts should be reduced to a level of insignificance through adherence to local development standards, ordinances, and individual project control measures. The 3001 Buck Owens Boulevard and Tracts 6003 and 6042 projects are farther from the Site and not expected to have significant cumulative impacts with the Gibson project.

c. The project ☐ has ☒does not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. See evaluations in Section 3. Air Quality and Section 7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

Based on evidence provided in this Initial Study, DTSC makes the following determination:

☒ The proposed project COULD NOT HAVE a significant effect on the environment. A **Negative Declaration** will be prepared.

☐ The proposed project COULD HAVE a significant effect on the environment. However, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** will be prepared.

☐ The proposed project MAY HAVE a significant effect on the environment. An **Environmental Impact Report** is required.

☐ The proposed project MAY HAVE a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **Environmental Impact Report** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ The proposed project COULD HAVE a significant effect on the environment. However, all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. Therefore, nothing further is required.

APPROVALS:

- signed Paul Ruffin -		10/18/2006
Preparer's Signature		Date
Paul Ruffin	Hazardous Substances Engineer	916-255-6677
Preparer's Name	Preparer's Title	Phone #
- signed Mohinder S. Sandhu -		10/18/2006
Branch Chief Signature		Date
Mohinder S. Sandhu	Chief, Standardized Permitting and Corrective Action Branch	916-255-3716
Branch Chief Name	Branch Chief Title	Phone #

ATTACHMENT A

REFERENCE LIST

- October 2005 Gibson Environmental Site *Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc.
- http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm
- Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program map, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/images/fmmp2002_300.pdf
- http://valleyair.org/aqinfo/attainment.htm
- http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/CEQA%20Rules/GAMAQI%20Jan%202002%20Rev.pdf
- http://www.sacredsites.com/americas/united_states/united_states.html
- http://www.co.kern.ca.us/planning/pdfs/kcgp/KCGPChp4Safety.pdf (see figures 12 and 13)
- http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm
- http://www.ci.bakersfield.ca.us/cityservices/devsrv/pdfs/generalplan.pdf
- *http://www.co.kern.ca.us/roads/pdf/Traffic_Counts.pdf*
- *http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/saferesr/trafdata/2005all.htm*
- http://www.bakersfieldcity.us/weblink7/Browse.aspx?startid=342577
- Diesel Emission Risk Calculations, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc., submitted to SJVUAPCD via e-mail on September 15, 2006
- Chemical-specific Emission Risk Calculations, prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc., submitted to SJVUAPCD via e-mail on September 20, 2006
- Emission Calculations (NOx, PM10, ROG), prepared by Geomatrix Consultants, Inc., submitted to SJVUAPCD via e-mail on September 26, 2006
- October 5, 2006, Ms. Georgia A Stewart, SJVUAPCD, to Mr. Mohinder S. Sandhu, DTSC, Subject: Initial Study/Draft Negative Declaration, Gibson Environmental (Bakersfield) Site Soil Pile Removal
- September 6, 2006 letter from Pacific Legacy Incorporated Re: Gibson Environmental Site, Bakersfield, California Historical Resources Information System and Native American Heritage Commission records searches
- August 17, 2006, Reconnaissance Level Biological Survey Results for the Proposed Gibson Environmental Site Located in the City of Bakersfield, California, prepared by Quad Knopf
- October 9, 2006, Ms. Kathryn L. Martin, Memorandum “Gibson Soil Pile Removal Project – Cumulative Impacts Analysis

ATTACHMENT B

FIGURES

- **Figure 1:** Site Location Map
- **Figure 2:** Site Plan
- **Figure 3:** Truck Haul Route Overview
- **Figure 4:** Truck Haul Route

ATTACHMENT C

"Reconnaissance Level Biological Survey Results for the Proposed Gibson Environmental Site Located in the City of Bakersfield, California," prepared by Mr. Russell E. Sweet, Biologist, Quad Knopf, August 17, 2006.